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- Introduction
- EIR criteria for fidelity measures
- Creating a fidelity measure
- Common challenges
- Breaking into small work groups to work on fidelity measures
EIR Criteria for Fidelity Measures

- Defines what constitutes full implementation of each key component of the EIR-funded intervention that appears in the project logic model.
- Specifies for each key component a threshold level of implementation that must be met for that component to be scored as achieving “fidelity”.
- Specifies for each key component a threshold level of implementation at the level of the entire sample – across all schools, all teachers, etc., in the implementation sample.
- Specifies for each key component the sources of data for calculating a score on fidelity of implementation.
Creating a Fidelity Measure: Defining What Constitutes Full Fidelity In terms of Measurable Indicators

-1- Define fidelity of implementation of key component
  - Usually multi-part
  - e.g., Fidelity of implementation = teachers participate in all training opportunities provided by program

-2- Restate definition into a set of measurable indicators
  - Quantitative
  - e.g., “Teachers attend initial 5-day training, quarterly meetings, and annual 1-day re-training in years 2-3”

-3- Determine unit of implementation where fidelity “resides”
  - Establishes base unit of measurement
  - e.g., teachers, schools, districts, program
Creating a Fidelity Measure: Creating An Overall Score and Threshold that Defines “Fidelity of Implementation”

-4- For each indicator, determine scores for levels of implementation
-5- Determine overall scoring for component across indicators (at unit level)
-6- Establish threshold score (across indicators) that represents fidelity at unit level

Usually ordinal

- e.g., 1 = low level of implementation; 2 = moderate level of implementation; 3 = high level of implementation
- e.g., “Total score across three indicators ranges from 0 to 6 for a teacher”
- e.g., threshold fidelity score for a teacher ≥5

Total ranges from 0 to X
Creating a Fidelity Measure: Define Threshold Score at Program/Sample Level that Constitutes “Fidelity of Implementation”

-7- Determine scores for level of implementation at program level

-8a- Establish threshold score that represents fidelity at program level

Across all units in implementing sample:

e.g., 1 = ≤50% of teachers meet threshold score of 5; 2 = 51-75% of teachers meet threshold score of 5; 3 = ≥76% of teachers meet threshold score of 5

Minimum score for fidelity:

e.g., at program level, score of 2 (≥51% of teachers meet score representing fidelity)
Creating a Fidelity Measure: When Fidelity Measure Involves Rolling Up Score to Grade/School/District Before Determining Sample Level Fidelity

-7a- Determine scores for level of implementation when unit level is rolled up to next higher level (e.g., school)

Across all higher-level units in implementing sample

-8a- Determine threshold for fidelity at higher level

Levels of implementation

e.g., 1 = ≤50% of teachers in school meet threshold score of 5;
2 = 51-75% of teachers in school meet threshold score of 5;
3 = ≥76% of teachers in school meet threshold score of 5

-9a- Establish threshold score that represents fidelity at sample level

Minimum score for fidelity

e.g., at sample level, ≥51% of schools have score of 2

e.g., 1 = ≤50% of schools have score of 2;
2 = 51-75% of schools have score of 2;
3 = ≥76% of schools have score of 2
Common Challenges

- Whether and how to weight indicators differently
  - Using different score ranges for indicators essentially applies more weight to indicators with higher total scores (intentionally or inadvertently)

- Making all indicators for a key component have the same base unit of implementation
  - Makes it more difficult to combine indicators with different base units
Common Challenges (2 of 2)

- Choosing between defining fidelity by (a) actions of grantee, (b) participation of target individuals, or (c) both
  - Should align with logic model and whether participation is included as key component(s)

- Determining how to include quality and quantity in measuring fidelity of implementation
  - Makes it more difficult to combine indicators with different base units
New Challenge of Adapting Implementation Evaluation When Intervention Changes because of COVID

**STEP 1**  
Review logic model & modify, if needed

**STEP 2**  
Review fidelity measure & modify, if needed

**STEP 3**  
Track versions of program model being implemented

**STEP 4**  
Assess and report fidelity for all versions of program model to tell a story
Analysis of fidelity of implementation will need to take account of which versions of program model are being implemented, when and with whom:

- Which versions: Virtual, blended, in-person
- Same or different versions in different schools
- Same or different versions in each school over time
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